



NUCLEAR DIVISION

INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

(les fwd. for immediate attentio:
 E. G. Struxness (get ready for a
 meeting...)
 D. E. Reichle
 10/27/77, SIA

OCT 27 1977

POST OFFICE BOX X, OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE 37830

Y/4G-0091/4

To (Name) R. G. Jordan
 Division (Y-12)
 Location 9704-2

Date October 26, 1977

Please Print
 Responding: Originating Dept.

M-143

Copy to S. I. Auerbach ✓
 R. F. Hibbs
 H. Postma

Answering letter date
 Subject Monitoring Data and Reports f
 Oak Ridge-DOE Facilities

RECEIVED ESD-

OCT 77 11: 2 Stan Auerbach has expressed interest in and concern about monitoring data and reports for Oak Ridge-DOE facilities. They are particularly concerned about the lack of sediment sampling for metals in East Fork Poplar Creek. They are also concerned about the way sediment data from other locations are summarized in reports such as Y/UB-4 (1975) and Y/UE-6 (1976). Because no indication of sample numbers or variation in mean concentrations within sampling locations is given, it is difficult to determine statistical significance between concentration values found at different sampling stations.

According to Auerbach's staff, the data analysis for mercury levels in Poplar Creek might be complicated because of different distribution functions, neither of which appear to be normal for samples obtained in 1975 and 1976. They have questions concerning sampling station locations in Poplar Creek (they are not given in the reports) and method of analysis for sediment samples (atomic absorption or emission spectrograph).

There is also some concern in the Environmental Sciences Division (ESD) about our compliance with Sections 308 and 504 of the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments (PL-92-500) that require biological monitoring in aquatic environments. ESD relies on public documents such as the monitoring reports noted above as input to their assessment of ORGDP. Because of this, they would like to provide any expertise they currently have in assisting you and your staff in making these monitoring reports more valuable.

I would like to suggest that you or your staff might meet with Auerbach and his staff to determine if their perceptions and concerns are justified and to decide whether they can be of assistance in evaluating the current aquatic monitoring program (selection of monitoring stations and parameters, sampling, analyses of samples, data analyses, and reporting) and also in the design and implementation of monitoring efforts.

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE
 Technical Information Office Date

3/21/94

C. R. Richmond

ChemRisk Document No. 3056